

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SCOTT ROSE, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

STEPHENS INSTITUTE,

Defendant.

Case No. 09-cv-05966-PJH (JCS)

**ORDER DENYING PERMISSION TO  
FILE MOTION TO COMPEL AND  
REQUIRING IN PERSON MEET AND  
CONFER.**

Re: Dkt. No. 118


Plaintiffs filed a letter requesting leave to file a motion to compel (the "Request"). In the Request, plaintiffs attach copies of emails between counsel regarding defendant's response to plaintiffs' interrogatories. In violation of this Court's order, plaintiffs' counsel demanded an in person meet and confer in his first email on the interrogatories. That email did not even attempt to address the objections raised by defendant in its responses, or offer a compromise. On the other hand, defendant's response neither attempted to justify its objections (or propose a compromise), nor offered a date for the meet and confer within ten (10) days of the demand for such a meeting. Because the parties have all violated their duty to meet and confer in good faith, the Court **ORDERS** as follows;

1. The Request is denied.
2. Within ten (10) days of today lead trial counsel shall meet and confer in person on the subject interrogatories. The meeting place shall be determined by the place of the last in person meet and confer: If it was at the office or city of plaintiffs' lead counsel, then this meeting shall be at the office or city of defendant's lead counsel. If the previous meeting was at the office or city of defendant's lead counsel, then this meeting shall be at the office or city of plaintiffs' lead counsel.
3. Within ten (10) days of the in person meeting, the parties shall file a joint letter as

described in the Court's previous order.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: December 15, 2015



---

JOSEPH C. SPERO  
United States Magistrate Judge